

**1. Frederic V. Salerno**

[Docket No. ID-2868-000]

Take notice that on February 3, 1995, Frederic V. Salerno (Applicant), tendered for filing an application under section 305(b) to hold the following positions: Director—Orange and Rockland Utilities, Inc.; Director—The Bear Stearns Companies Inc.

*Comment date:* March 2, 1995 in accordance with Standard Paragraph E at the end of this notice.

**2. Morgan Stanley Capital Group**

[Docket No. ER94-1384-002]

Take notice that on January 12, 1995, Morgan Stanley Capital Group Inc. tendered for filing a revised rate schedule in the above-referenced docket.

*Comment date:* March 9, 1995 in accordance with Standard Paragraph E at the end of this notice.

**3. Mid-American Resources, Inc.**

[Docket No. ER95-78-000]

Take notice that on January 24, 1995, Mid-American Resources, Inc. tendered for filing supplemental information to its October 27, 1994 filing in the above-referenced docket.

*Comment date:* March 9, 1995 in accordance with Standard Paragraph E at the end of this notice.

**4. Public Service Electric and Gas Company**

[Docket No. ER94-1369-000]

Take notice that on February 8, 1995, Public Service Electric and Gas Company tendered for filing an amendment in the above-referenced docket.

*Comment date:* March 9, 1995 in accordance with Standard Paragraph E at the end of this notice.

**Standard Paragraph E**

Any person desiring to be heard or to protest said filing should file a motion to intervene or protest with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 825 North Capitol Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20426, in accordance with Rules 211 and 214 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 385.211 and 18 CFR 385.214). All such motions or protests should be filed on or before March 9, 1995. Protests will be considered by the Commission in determining the appropriate action to be taken, but will not serve to make protestants parties to the proceeding. Any person wishing to become a party must file a motion to intervene. Copies of this filing are on file with the

Commission and are available for public inspection.

**Lois D. Cashell,***Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 95-4969 Filed 2-28-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

[Docket No. RP95-167-000]

**Indicated Shippers v. Sea Robin Pipeline Company; Notice of Complaint and Request for Initiation of Investigation of Transportation Rates of Sea Robin Pipeline Company**

February 23, 1995.

Take notice that on February 16, 1995, Amoco Production Company, Amoco Energy Trading Corporation, Exxon Corporation, OXY USA Inc., Phillips Gas Marketing Company and Phillips Petroleum Company (Indicated Shippers) filed a complaint under Section 5 of the Natural Gas Act (NGA) 15 U.S.C. 717d (1988) and Section 5 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (OCSLA), 43 U.S.C. 1334 (1988) against Sea Robin Pipeline Company (Sea Robin) alleging that the maximum transportation rates currently being charged by Sea Robin are unjust, unreasonable or otherwise unlawful. The Indicated Shippers further request that the Commission immediately institute an investigation to determine whether Sea Robin's rates are unjust, unreasonable or otherwise unlawful, and to determine just and reasonable rates on a prospective basis.

Sea Robin's currently effective rates are based on the January 5, 1990 settlement in Sea Robin's last general Section 4 rate case in Docket No. RP88-181. This settlement was approved by the Commission on April 18, 1990 (51 FERC ¶ 61,046, reh'g. denied 51 FERC ¶ 61,315 (1990)). Since that time, the Indicated Shippers assert, Sea Robin's throughput has increased by approximately 52% and that in the 1991-1993 time period, Sea Robin's annual return on net plant has averaged approximately 50%. The Indicated Shippers estimate that Sea Robin's just and reasonable maximum rates, if based on current throughput and costs, would be at least 30% less than Sea Robin's currently effective rates.

Based largely on data taken from Sea Robin Form 2 reports, the Indicated Shippers claim that Sea Robin's just and reasonable maximum IT rate should not exceed 5.9¢/MMBtu. Consistent with Commission precedent in United Gas Pipe Line Company and ANR Storage Company, 47 FERC ¶ 61,285 (1989), the Commission is requested to order Sea Robin to file a cost and revenue study

and other schedules in accordance with 18 CFR 154.63(e)(2) and 154.63(f) as well as other documents sufficient to allow interested parties to fully evaluate Sea Robin's current cost-of-service and to permit the establishment of just and reasonable rates.

Any person desiring to be heard or to protest said complaint should file a motion to intervene or a protest with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 825 North Capitol Street, NE., Washington, DC 20426, in accordance with Rules 214 and 211 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure 18 CFR 385.214, 385.211. All such motions or protests should be filed on or before March 27, 1995. Protests will be considered by the Commission in determining the appropriate action to be taken, but will not serve to make protestants parties to the proceeding. Any person wishing to become a party must file a motion to intervene. Copies of this filing are on file with the Commission and are available for public inspection. Answers to this complaint shall be due on or before March 27, 1995.

**Lois D. Cashell,***Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 95-4948 Filed 2-28-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

[Docket No. MG91-5-002]

**Overthrust Pipeline Co.; Notice of Filing**

February 23, 1995.

Take notice that on February 14, 1995, Overthrust Pipeline Company (Overthrust) submitted revised standards of conduct under Order Nos. 497 *et seq.*<sup>1</sup> and Order Nos. 566 and 566-A.<sup>2</sup> Overthrust states that it is

<sup>1</sup> Order No. 497, 53 FR 22139 (June 14, 1988), III FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 30,820 (1988); Order No. 497-A, *order on rehearing*, 54 FR 52781 (December 22, 1989), III FERC Stats. & Regs. 30,868 (1989); Order No. 497-B, *order extending sunset date*, 55 FR 53291 (December 28, 1990), III FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 30,908 (1990); Order No. 497-C, *order extending sunset date*, 57 FR 9 (January 2, 1992), III FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 30,934 (1991), rehearing denied, 57 FR 5815 (February 18, 1992), 58 FERC ¶ 61,139 (1992); Tenneco Gas v. FERC (affirmed in part and remanded in part), 969 F.2d 1187 (D.C. Cir. 1992); Order No. 497-D, *order on remand and extending sunset date*, III FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 30,958 (December 4, 1992), 57 FR 58978 (December 14, 1992); Order No. 497-E, *order on rehearing and extending sunset date*, 59 FR 243 (January 4, 1994), 65 FERC ¶ 61,381 (December 23, 1993); Order No. 497-F, *order denying rehearing and granting clarification*, 59 FR 15336 (April 1, 1994), 66 FERC ¶ 61,347 (March 24, 1994); and Order No. 497-G, *order extending sunset date*, 59 FR 32884 (June 27, 1994), III FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 30,996 (June 17, 1994).

<sup>2</sup> Standards of Conduct and Reporting Requirements for Transportation and Affiliate

Continued

revising its standards to incorporate the changes required by the Commission's January 20, 1995 Order on Standards of Conduct.<sup>3</sup>

Any person desiring to be heard or to protest said filing should file a motion to intervene or protest with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 825 North Capitol Street, NE., Washington, DC 20426, in accordance with Rules 211 or 214 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 385.211 or 385.214). All such motions to intervene or protest should be filed on or before March 10, 1995. Protests will be considered by the Commission in determining the appropriate action to be taken, but will not serve to make protestants parties to the proceeding. Any person wishing to become a party must file a motion to intervene. Copies of this filing are on file with the Commission and are available for public inspection.

**Lois D. Cashell,**

*Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 95-4945 Filed 2-28-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

[Docket No. RP95-166-000]

**Pan-Alberta Gas (U.S.) Inc.  
Complainant v. Pacific Gas and  
Electric Company and Pacific Gas  
Transmission Company Respondents;  
Notice of Complaint**

February 23, 1995.

Take notice that on February 16, 1995, Pan-Alberta Gas (U.S.) Inc. (PAG-US), submits for filing a complaint against Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) and Pacific Gas Transmission Company (PGT) (jointly, Respondents).

PAG-US complains that the terms on which PG&E recently offered to permanently release a "package" of two assignments of FTS-1 capacity on the PGT system (PGT Release Package) are unlawfully discriminatory and anti-competitive.

PAG-US argue that in its PGT Release Package, PG&E offered to permanently release (1) An unspecified quantity of capacity on the PGT System from Kingsgate, British Columbia to Malin, Oregon, and (2) a similarly unspecified quantity of separate, additional capacity

on the system from Stanfield, Oregon<sup>1</sup> to Malin. As a condition of the release, PG&E required that, for each unit of Kingsgate to Malin capacity sought by a bidder, that bidder would have to agree to take 3.5 units of additional Stanfield to Malin capacity.

PAG-US argue that PG&E's mandatory bundling of this unrelated PGT capacity (1) Constitutes an unlawful tying arrangement, (2) amount, in effect, to an unlawful attempt by PG&E to collect a rate in excess of the as billed rate for its Kingsgate to Malin capacity, and (3) violates the requirements of Order No. 636 and PGT's tariff that conditions imposed on capacity releases be reasonable and nondiscriminatory.

PAG-US states that the Commission should (1) Set aside any capacity releases that may actually have been consummated on the discriminatory and anti-competitive terms of PG&E's January PGT Release Package, (2) require that, if PG&E still desires to release Kingsgate to Malin and Stanfield to Malin capacity, it must do so on an unbundled basis, with neither block being mandatorily tied to the other, and (3) provide any additional relief which is deems appropriate in the circumstances.

Any person desiring to be heard or to protest said complaint should file a motion to intervene or a protest with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 825 North Capitol Street, NE., Washington, DC 20426, in accordance with Rules 214 and 211 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure 18 CFR 385.214, 385.211. All such motions or protests should be filed on or before March 27, 1995. Protests will be considered by the Commission in determining the appropriate action to be taken, but will not serve to make protestants parties to the proceeding. Any person wishing to become a party must file a motion to intervene. Copies of this filing are on file with the Commission and are available for public inspection. Answers to this complaint shall be due on or before March 27, 1995.

**Lois D. Cashell,**

*Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 95-4946 Filed 2-28-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

Transactions, Order No. 566, 59 FR 32885 (June 27, 1994), III FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 30,997 (June 17, 1994); Order No. 566-A, *order on rehearing*, 59 FR 52896 (October 20, 1994), 69 FERC ¶ 61,044 (October 14, 1994); Order No. 566-B, *order on rehearing*, 59 FR 65707 (December 21, 1994); 69 FERC ¶ 61,334 (December 14, 1994); *appeal docketed sub nom. Conoco, Inc. v. FERC*, D.C. Cir. No. 94-1745 (December 13, 1994).

<sup>3</sup> 70 FERC ¶ 61,054 (1995).

<sup>1</sup> Stanfield is an intermediary point on the PGT system approximately halfway between Kingsgate and Malin.

[Docket No. MG88-11-003]

**Questar Pipeline Company; Notice of Filing**

February 23, 1995.

Take notice that on February 14, 1995, Questar Pipeline Company (Questar) submitted revised standards of conduct under Order Nos. 497 *et seq.*<sup>1</sup> and Order Nos. 566 and 566-A.<sup>2</sup> Questar states that it is revising its standards to incorporate the changes required by the Commission's January 20, 1995 Order on Standards of Conduct.<sup>3</sup>

Any person desiring to be heard or to protest said filing should file a motion to intervene or protest with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 825 North Capitol Street, NE., Washington, DC 20426, in accordance with Rules 211 or 214 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 385.211 or 385.214). All such motions to intervene or protest should be filed on or before March 10, 1995. Protests will be considered by the Commission in determining the appropriate action to be taken, but will not serve to make protestants parties to the proceeding. Any person wishing to become a party must file a motion to intervene. Copies of this filing are on file with the Commission and are available for public inspection.

**Lois D. Cashell,**

*Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 95-4947 Filed 2-28-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

<sup>1</sup> Order No. 497, 53 FR 22139 (June 14, 1988), III FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 30,820 (1988); Order No. 497-A, *order on rehearing*, 54 FR 52781 (December 22, 1989), III FERC Stats. & Regs. 30,868 (1989); Order No. 497-B, *order extending sunset date*, 55 FR 53291 (December 28, 1990), III FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 30,908 (1990); Order No. 497-C, *order extending sunset date*, 57 FR 9 (January 2, 1992), III FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 30,934 (1991), rehearing denied, 57 FR 5815 (February 18, 1992), 58 FERC ¶ 61,139 (1992); *Tenneco Gas v. FERC* (affirmed in part and remanded in part), 969 F. 2d 1187 (D.C. Cir. 1992); Order No. 497-D, *order on remand and extending sunset date*, III FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 30,958 (December 4, 1992), 57 FR 58978 (December 14, 1992); Order No. 497-E, *order on rehearing and extending sunset date*, 59 FR 243 (January 4, 1994), 65 FERC ¶ 61,381 (December 23, 1993); Order No. 497-F, *order denying rehearing and granting clarification*, 59 FR 15336 (April 1, 1994), 66 FERC ¶ 61,347 (March 24, 1994); and Order No. 497-G, *order extending sunset date*, 59 FR 32884 (June 27, 1994), III FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 30,996 (June 17, 1994).

<sup>2</sup> Standards of Conduct and Reporting Requirements for Transportation and Affiliate Transactions, Order No. 566, 59 FR 32885 (June 27, 1994), III FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 30,997 (June 17, 1994); Order No. 566-A, *order on rehearing*, 59 FR 52896 (October 20, 1994), 69 FERC ¶ 61,044 (October 14, 1994); Order No. 566-B, *order on rehearing*, 59 FR 65707 (December 21, 1994); 69 FERC ¶ 61,334 (December 14, 1994); *appeal docketed sub nom. Conoco, Inc. v. FERC*, D.C. Cir. No. 94-1745 (December 13, 1994).

<sup>3</sup> 70 FERC ¶ 61,054 (1995).